

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 1, 2001
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
July 18, 2001 (Meeting #19)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member
Jay Cervený	City of La Center Council Member
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Foster Church	The Oregonian
Steve Dearborn	MillerNash
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Matt Lewis	CCHBA
Mike Lookingbill	RTC
Erin Middlewood	The Columbian
George Vartanian	Self

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Evan Dust	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning

Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Oliver Orijako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
John Tyler	Clark County ESA Program
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development

1. Roll call / Introductions

Commissioner Stanton called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM at the Dollar's Corner Fire Station. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Review June 6, 2001 meeting Notes.

Commissioner Stanton called for comments on the June 6 summary notes. No corrections or changes to the summary notes were made.

3. Status of Buildable Lands analysis (RCW 36.70A.215, formerly SB6094)

Pat Lee introduced the discussion of the Buildable Lands Report document that was distributed with the agenda. The report responds to the requirements of the Growth Management Act, section 215.

Oliver Orijako presented the specifics in the report. Most of what is in the report was in the Plan Monitoring Report. The densities that were assumed in 1994 are not currently being achieved. Orijako outlined the assumptions that were used in the report. The cities that do not extend urban services outside of the city limits tend to have lower densities in the UGA areas outside of the city limits. The information will continue to be updated before it is forwarded to the state. Page 19 of the report looks at the residential housing split. One issue that will still be looked at by the Board is what employment density to use as an assumption for the modeling. The infrastructure assumptions may have to be reevaluated.

Many of the assumptions in the plan are not being met. The county and the cities are discussing how this can be addressed. Table 28 is only a comparison and will be removed before it is presented to the state.

Page 23 has an error in the table narrative .

Lowry commented that the cities and UGA numbers are segregated. The county may be developing at much less density than the cities. We may want to include in the table the unincorporated areas that cannot be developed at urban densities. Another comment is that it seems inconsistent to say we are not meeting densities and that we do not need more land to meet the 2020 goals. This should be explained in the report. Household size may be the key factor. Burkman says that we need to keep track of the stats for

outside of city limits. Lowry is referring to urban holding 10 and 20 zones. Orijako says that they will look into how to best address the issue. Presenting by city and UGA helps to show this distinction. Pridemore notes that we can talk about how many developments are in the specific areas. Lowry recommends that we only look at lands with urban zoning. Stanton asks about the second point of how density targets are not being met yet there is still no need for new lands. Orijako speculates that it could be a change in household size or that the assumptions were generous in the first place. Snell says that the assumption for infrastructure could be off. Orijako also mentions that critical lands could change the numbers. Lee adds that the critical lands assumptions are being monitored and this could contribute to the discrepancies. Orijako says that there are numerous half- to one acre parcels that were assumed to be higher density and there is only one residence on the parcel. Burkman asks if those changes should be in the report to explain the effects and factors. Orijako responds that those notes will be added to the report.

4. Update of the population and employment allocation process.

Lee says that they were hoping to have more info for today's meeting and that info has not yet been made available from the cities. The new memo from Scott Bailey (Washington Employment Security Department) has some changed approaches and we will have to pay attention to these changes. There is little to report now. Stanton asks if the cities have been trying to attract specific businesses. Idsinga says yes.

5. Technical Advisory Committee Update

The TAC is working on looking at achieving higher densities. The RFP for the EIS is out and proposals will be back next Friday.

6. Next meeting time and date

The next meeting is August 15th if necessary. First cut of the population and employment allocation information should be ready for that meeting. The meeting may be cancelled if the info is not ready.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - july 18 2001(#19).doc